

change in output position between the first and second sizes held by said holding means of the image selected in the selection step; and

a program code of the rendering step of rendering the output image generated in the generation step at the rendering position determined in the determination step,

wherein said output image is comprised of more than one object, each object having a rendering attribute, and

wherein said rendering step renders the output image on the basis of the rendering attributes of the objects comprising the output image.

30. to 40. (Canceled).

#### REMARKS

Claims 1 to 29 are pending in the application, with Claims 30 to 40 having been cancelled herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement with respect to non-elected Claims 12 to 14 and 26 to 28. Applicant submits that non-elected Claims 12 to 14 and 26 to 28 should be examined together with pending Claims 1 to 11, 15 to 25 and 29, as amended, because all such claims are believed to be directed to image rendering on the basis of rendering attributes of objects within the image. As such, Applicants submit that a common search and examination of Claims 1 to 29 can be made without serious burden, and therefore restriction of such claims is believed to be improper. (See MPEP § 803).

Claims 1 to 11, 15 to 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that the description and figures of the subject application more than adequately provide support for the combinations of amended independent Claims 1, 15 and 29. In particular, the Examiner entered a restriction requirement which identified Claims 1 to 11, 15 to 25 and 29 as being in Group II, which is directed to a method for a computer graphic manipulation process. As originally filed, Claim 1 included a holding means, a selection means, a generation means, a determination means, and a rendering means. Applicants submit that support for this originally-claimed combination of Claim 1 is fully provided in Figures 2 and 3, and their accompanying descriptions.

Specifically, the holding means for holding the output image in first and second sizes is supported by Figure 2, and pages 13 and 14 of the description. The selection means is supported by step S31 of Figure 3, and page 14, lines 18 to 26, and page 15, lines 1 to 15 of the description. The generation means and the determination means are supported by step S33 of Figure 3, page 15, lines 16 to 26, and page 16, lines 1 to 7 of the description, in which the resized image is generated and the rendering position is determined. Finally, the rendering means is supported by step S34 of Figure 3, and page 16, lines 8 to 17. Accordingly, the originally-claimed combination of Claim 1 is fully supported by Figures 2 and 3, and their accompanying descriptions.

The amendment to Claim 1, “wherein said output image is comprised of more than one object, each object having a rendering attribute, and wherein said rendering means renders the output image on the basis of the rendering attributes of the objects comprising the output image”, is fully supported by Figure 4 and its accompanying description. In particular, it is seen in Figure 4 that the output image is comprised of more than one object (objects A, B and C), each object having a rendering attribute (x-coordinate). (See Figure 4; page 19, lines 4 to 46; and page 20, lines 1 to 13).

Accordingly, based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the originally-claimed combination of Claim 1, as well as the combination of amended Claim 1, are fully supported by at least Figures 3 and 4, and their accompanying descriptions, which is within the invention illustrated in Figures 2 to 5. In this regard, Applicants submits that the restriction set forth by the Examiner was not based on specific figures, but instead was based on types of invention. Applicants further submit that the originally-claimed combination of Claim 1, as well as the combination of amended Claim 1, are both directed to a method for a computer graphic manipulation process. The combinations of amended independent Claims 15 and 29 contain substantially similar features as that of amended independent Claim 1, and are also believed to be fully supported by Figures 3 and 4, and their accompanying descriptions.

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the § 112, first paragraph, rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. (See M.P.E.P. § 2163.03).

Independent Claims 1, 15 and 29 are therefore believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

No other matters being raised in the Office Action, and in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 40,595

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 49316 v 1